REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-11 and 26-41 are pending, of which claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 26, 32, and 35-36 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-11, 26, and 28-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,080,207 to Kroening et al. (hereinafter, "Kroening") (*Office Action* p. 2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

generating an image of an operating system with a host computing device;

communicating the image of the operating system from the host computing device to a software development peripheral;

executing the operating system corresponding to the image with the software development peripheral;

communicating test information generated by the operating system corresponding to the image from the software development peripheral to the host computing device; and

displaying the test information generated by the operating system at the host computing device.

Kroening does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 1, such as "communicating the image of the operating system from the host computing device to a software development peripheral", "executing the operating

system corresponding to the image with the software development peripheral", and then "communicating test information generated by the operating system corresponding to the image to the host computing device".

Kroening describes a system to create and deliver a software configuration to a customer who purchases a computer (*Kroening* col.3, lines 59-61). An image builder creates a disk image of a desired software configuration and then transfers the image to a storage device which is connected to a server that delivers the image (*Kroening* col.3, line 64 to col.4, line 1). The image builder receives a customer order from an order entry system, and then obtains a starting configuration (referred to as a baseline image) and additional incremental images from the storage device to create the desired software configuration (*Kroening* col.4, lines 8-18; col.4, lines 50-60).

The Office cites the image builder of Kroening as the recited software development peripheral, but otherwise only refers to Figs. 1-4 of Kroening for teaching the other components and features recited in claim 1 (*Office Action* p.2). As described above, the image builder of Kroening receives a customer order from an order entry system, but then transfers the image to a separate storage device. Accordingly, Kroening does not show executing the operating system corresponding to the image (which is received from the host computing device) with the software development peripheral, and then communicating <u>test</u> information generated by the operating system corresponding to the image from the software development peripheral back to the host computing device, as recited in claim 1.

Further, the image builder of Kroening does not execute an operating system corresponding to the image to generate test information that is communicated to the host computing device, as recited in claim 1. Kroening only describes that a software configuration is created – not that the software is tested or even executed. Presumably, the software obtained by the image builder from the storage device in Kroening has already been tested for consumer use. For example, Kroening describes that file names are examined by their name and creation date to determine which are to be replaced (*Kroening* col.5, lines 11-13). The baseline and/or additional incremental images (i.e., software as referred to in Kroening) are merely layered by the image builder to create the desired software configuration (*Kroening* col.4, lines 55-60). Kroening does not execute software to generate test information and, as such, Applicant disagrees that Kroening is even applicable as a reference with regard to the subject application.

Further, Kroening does not show displaying the test information generated by the operating system (and received from the software development peripheral) at the host computing device, as recited in claim 1. The Office cites Kroening for a monitor (22) that permits the display of information (*Office Action* p.2; *Kroening* col.6, lines 1-2). However, the monitor (22) cited by the Office is coupled to the image builder as shown in Fig. 1 of Kroening. Contrary to Kroening, claim 1 recites that the test information generated at the software development peripheral is communicated to the host computing device where the test information is displayed. Kroening does not describe that test information is generated at a first device and then communicated for display at a second device.

lee⊗hayes

11

MSI-920US M02

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Kroening for at least these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-11 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-11 are allowable over Kroening for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 2 recites "recognizing a configuration identification of the software development peripheral with a cross-platform development component of the host computing device when the software development peripheral is communicatively linked with the host computing device."

The Office cites Kroening for "recognizing a configuration identification of the software development peripheral", as recited in claim 2 (*Office Action* p.3; *Kroening* col.3, lines1-7; col.7, lines 17-20). However, the cited sections of Kroening simply refer to the image builder which identifies common portions of multiple software configurations, and calculates a configuration identification of entries in a bill of materials for a software configuration requested by a customer. There is no mention in Kroening of a component in a device that recognizes a configuration identification of a software development peripheral when the software development peripheral is communicatively linked with the host computing device, as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Kroening and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 recites "debugging the test information generated by the operating system with a cross-platform development component of the host computing device". Kroening does not show or disclose debugging test information, as

recited in claim 5. As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Kroening merely assembles software images to create a software configuration for a customer. The software images in Kroening would presumably already be tested and debugged for commercial use. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable over Kroening and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 and 8-11 recite features that have not been addressed by the Office, and Applicant respectfully requests an examination of these claims if the Office does not indicate that claims 5-6 and 8-11 are allowable in the next non-final Office Action. At page 3 of the current Office Action, the Office indicates that "claims 3, 5, 6-11 and 32, 35-41" are rejected, but then only discusses features recited in claims 3 and 7. Accordingly, the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 recites a system, comprising:

a host computing device configured to generate an image of an operating system; and

a software development peripheral configured to:

receive the image of the operating system from the host computing device;

execute the operating system corresponding to the image of the operating system; and

communicate test information generated by the operating system to the host computing device for display.

lee●hayes   13   MS1-920US M02

The Office rejects claim 26 for the same reasons that claim 1 is rejected (*Office Action* p.2). As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Kroening does not show or disclose a software development peripheral to receive an image of an operating system from a host computing device, execute the operating system corresponding to the image, and then communicate test information generated by the operating system to the host computing device for display, as recited in claim 26.

Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable over Kroening for at least the several reasons described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 27-41 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 26. Additionally, some or all of claims 27-41 are allowable over Kroening for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 28 recites that "the host computing device is further configured to recognize the software development peripheral as a plug and play device when the software development peripheral is communicatively linked with the host computing device." The Office rejects claim 28 for the same reasons that claim 2 is rejected (*Office Action* p.3). As described above in response to the rejection of claim 2, there is no mention in the cited sections of Kroening of a component in a device that recognizes a software development peripheral as a plug and play device when the software development peripheral is communicatively linked with the host computing device, as recited in claim 28. Accordingly, claim 28 is allowable over Kroening and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

lee@hayes

14

MSI-920US M02

Claims 27-41 are indicated as being rejected at page 3 of the current Office Action. However, the Office only discusses features recited in claims 29-31 and 33-34. Claims 32 and 35-41 have not been addressed by the Office, and Applicant respectfully requests an examination of these claims if the Office does not indicate that claims 32 and 35-41 are allowable in the next non-final Office Action.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-11 and 26-41 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 13, 2005.   By: _____

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

lee⊛hayes   15   MS1-920US M02